

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XX

New York, Wednesday, September 24, 1919

Number 255

Contents

The Week	213
Editorials	
Will the Republicans Save the League.....	215
The Police Strike.....	217
Mr. Rublee and Article X.....	218
The Cummins Bill.....	220
To Stabilize the Living Wage	221
General Articles	
England and the Senate Inquisition.....	W. P. Crozier 224
Underfed Children.....	W. L. Cheney 226
The Spaces of Uncertainty.....	Piccolo 228
The Heir of Eastern Feudalism.....	H. N. Brailsford 228
On a German Railway Train.....	Alice Hamilton 232
After the Play.....	F. H. 234
Diabutsu (Verse)	Elizabeth T. Coatsworth 234
Reviews of Books	
Mr. Dooley.....	Francis Hackett 235
Soviet Russia from the Inside	Alvin Johnson 236
The Divine Right of Kings.....	W. P. M. K. 237
Pater Reprinted.....	S. Y. 238
Peter Middleton.....	238

MR. WILSON must be aware of the inconsistencies in many of his addresses; yet those inconsistencies he has repeated all the way across the Continent. He seems, for instance, never to be certain whether he ought to describe the Allied diplomats as friends or enemies of the Fourteen Points. On one occasion he speaks of a "people's peace"—and again he says (as at Indianapolis) "I need not tell you that at every turn in these discussions we came across some secret treaty, some understanding that had never been made public before, some understanding that embarrassed the whole settlement." He seems also to be doubtful how best to describe the Germans. At Omaha, for example, they were both powerless and mighty. "We did not ask Germany's consent with regard to the meaning of any one of those terms while we were in Paris," he said. "We told her what they meant and said 'sign here.'" But that is only one picture of the Germans. He has also, in making a case against amendments, to paint a completely different picture of German power. "Do they want me to ask the Germans if I may read the treaty to them in words the United States Senate thinks it ought to be written in?"

The Week

ONE should not expect a very scrupulous regard for facts in popular stump speeches, even when the speaker is the President of the United States. Many of Mr. Wilson's statements as to the cost of living and the treaty of peace may thus be regarded as in line with our prevailing standards of political campaigning. But the President perhaps reached the limit of oratorical license when he referred to his treaty as "a people's treaty," and declared "We must take it or leave it"—"It is this treaty or no other." If this is true, what is left of representative government? Surely the people of this country have not forgotten that the treaty was drawn by a few elder statesmen, sitting, for the most part, in secret conference. The first time "the people" have even indirectly come into the process of ratification is in the present consideration of the treaty by a popular representative body. Must this body "take it or leave it"—with no change? If Mr. Wilson were really concerned about the verdict of future history he would be more guarded in his references to the evils of minority government, of which he professes to regard Soviet Russia as the only sample.

MR. BULLITT'S testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate shows what happened to the President's plan for a League of Nations when it reached the conference of the Premiers. Various clauses dealing with questions such as freedom of the seas and disarmament were knocked out entirely. Article X was rewritten. Originally it provided for future territorial readjustments that might be necessary by reason of changes in present racial conditions and aspirations or present social and political relationships, pursuant to the principle of self-determination." This provision for readjustment the Allied statesmen would not accept. They struck out everything in the article designed to save the League from being an instrument to maintain the status quo. Mr. Wilson's plan called for guarantees against violent readjustments and guarantees of peaceful readjustment. What he got was a guarantee against readjustments of any sort.

IT is in his report upon Russia, however, that Mr. Bullitt's testimony is most damaging to pretensions of open diplomacy on the part of America's delegates in Paris. From Russia, where he was officially sent, Mr. Bullitt brought back a peace offer from the Soviets. The terms of this offer seem

to have corresponded almost exactly with the terms Mr. Lloyd George's secretary had previously defined as Great Britain's. They included, in return for withdrawal of troops and the raising of the blockade, an offer on the part of the Soviet Government to assume responsibility for Russia's foreign debts and to recognize "all existing de facto governments which had been set up in Russia and Finland." On the basis of this offer there could have been peace in Russia—and a peace which protected all of the various governmental groups now supported by the Allies. But at the moment of Mr. Bullitt's return from Moscow Kolchak began to show signs of success—and the offer that could have brought peace was tucked away in the files of the Hotel Crillon.

WHAT promise of peace with Russia have we won, as the prize of banking on Kolchak? The military position of the Soviet armies, says Major General Sir Frederick Maurice, in a new statement, is considerably stronger than it was six weeks ago. "There is every probability that during the winter they will be able to organize in the Caucasus and north of the Caspian forces to attack Denikin in the rear next spring. The advance on Petrograd from the west remains a promise which is never fulfilled. And so it goes on. Lives, money and material have been wasted on useless enterprises, and a solution is no nearer than it has ever been. The plain fact is that under pretence of contributing to the defeat of Germany, Great Britain entered into a number of commitments in the East which had no bearing whatever on the main issue of the war."

KOLCHAK'S most recent reverses apparently amount to a loss of his entire southern army—45,000 men—to the Soviet forces operating in the region of Aktiubinsk and Orsk. But despite the fact that his defeats have for months been growing more complete the American government gives no sign of possessing an alternative for the disastrous policy it chose in the Spring. The blockade is still in force. And Secretary Baker tells a committee of the Senate that American troops cannot be withdrawn from Siberia because of a "real military and humanitarian reason." They must keep the railways open for the Red Cross. But they also keep the roads open for American munitions in a war to which this country has given neither its legal nor moral support. In Chicago Senator Johnson and Senator Borah found enthusiastic support for their demand that our troops be withdrawn; banners declared "Welcome to the men who are bringing our boys back from Siberia." There are many signs that the American people are less patient with the Administration's policy—and the report that the Grand Duke Michael has arrived at Kolchak's headquarters (a new democratic convert) will not brighten American enthusiasm for the interventionist crusade.

THE election of Mr. Arthur Henderson to the House of Commons is certain to rock the prestige of the Lloyd George cabinet. In the January elections, when Hang the Kaiser was the government's issue, Mr. Henderson went down with many other Labor and Liberal leaders. Now, standing for election at Widnes, a conservative stronghold for

thirty years, he wins with a turnover of 5,000 voters in a constituency of 20,000. His victory, as he says, is an emphatic condemnation of the policies of the coalition government and of the cynical political compromise upon which it rests. With his entrance into the House of Commons Mr. Henderson becomes the one outstanding figure in British politics.

THE unanimity with which the British Trades Union Congress rejected Mr. Lloyd George's scheme for management of the coal mines must have surprised even the government. By a vote of 4,478,000 to 77,000—a proportion of 58 to 1—the Congress demanded nationalization of the mines and instructed its Parliamentary Committee to carry that message to the Premier. Quite as significant as the vote was the debate which accompanied it. Conservative trades union leaders like Mr. J. H. Thomas and Mr. William Brace supported many of the arguments of the more radical Mr. Smillie—and Mr. Thomas pledged his own powerful union to nationalization of the railways as well as the mines. Direct action is not certain to follow the decision of the Trades Union Congress. That question is postponed. If the government stands firm a special session of the Congress is to be summoned "to decide the form of action to be taken to compel the government" to give way.

A NEW act is being staged in the cynical game the Allies are playing in Hungary. Americans will remember that to oust a communist government of which they did not approve the Allied diplomats promised support to the Hungarian trade unions if they set up a moderate socialist government. The trade unionists took the word of the Allies at its face value, overthrew Bela Kun, and destroyed the army that was Hungary's defence. Whereupon the monarchists staged a coup d'état—and the Rumanian army marched into Budapest. For a time the Allied statesmen assailed Rumania's action. Her army must withdraw, they said. The Hungarians must have self-determination. But now that they have protested enough to establish their integrity the diplomats in Paris seem to taken a new tack. "The Peace Conference has not asked the Rumanians to withdraw from Hungary," says an Associated Press dispatch; "in fact, it has urged them to leave sufficient forces to guarantee order pending Hungary's establishment of some sort of protection to prevent reversion to Bolshevism and other disturbances." To condone military occupation, which means a denial of self-determination, the threat of Bolshevism is always a convenient specter.

DESPITE the good humor with which Herr Renner signed the treaty, a point upon which all the correspondents commented, Austria is in poor shape to receive a peace which fixes for her an indefinite indemnity and takes away rich lands and several million Germans. The economic situation in Austria seems to grow worse and worse. Fear of famine, and the fall in the value of the crown, are two factors making for unrest. Strikes prevail in all trades, even in the professions. Into a confused political situation a new element has been injected by the formation of a Citizens' Committee to fight the program of the workmen.

Finally, between various districts there are quarrels over food and prices. "Each district is for itself," says an Associated Press dispatch, "and all of them are against Vienna."

A "sedition" that extends to three-quarters of the Irish people is now proclaimed by the British government. The government has only one policy at present, according to Lord French, and that is "to secure for all law-abiding subjects freedom and protection"—by the use of "the most drastic measures" if necessary. This policy involves the use of police and military force to suppress the Sinn Fein parliament, to seize Sinn Fein literature, to raid for arms, and to re-arrest the leaders released from jail some months since. Lord French announces the government's policy from Belfast, but with apparently no reference to Sir Edward Carson's sedition and no reference to the wrecking of Fermoy last week by hundreds of British soldiers who took this vengeance on the town because a comrade had been killed by Sinn Feiners. The re-introduction of drastic military methods into Ireland serves notice on the Irish that Lloyd George agrees with the Tories in making no distinction between sedition and self-determination. The immediate result must almost necessarily be an intensification of Sinn Fein.

TWO decisions have been reached by the United Mine Workers, in convention at Cleveland, that will have a profound effect on the development of American trade union policy. The miners have proposed an alliance with the Railway Brotherhoods which, if consummated, will establish the strongest partnership in American industry. They have also determined to demand the nationalization of the mines in which they labor. Concrete proposals for nationalization may be submitted by the Committee on Resolutions. Apparently the right of way is first to be granted to the Railway Brotherhoods, in their campaign for the Plumb Plan, with nationalization of the mines to be demanded subsequently. The depth to which traditional American trade union policy has been shaken by recent events is most clearly shown when conservative unions like the Mine Workers and the Brotherhoods, with conservative leaders, go on beyond wages and hours and demand fundamental changes in the control of their industries.

STEEL workers in the Chicago district have refused to accept Mr. Wilson's proposal for a postponement of their strike, and have issued orders that will call out 150,000 workers from the plants of Indiana, South Chicago, Joliet and Milwaukee. Whether there is still a chance for rescinding this order, and for averting at least temporarily a strike in other parts of the country, is to be determined by a union conference that will be held after this issue of The New Republic has gone to press. In any event, certainly the union leaders have made use of every means to present their demands without calling a strike. Turned down by the Steel Corporation they put their case before the President. Even now they may be able to hold the rank and file in check. But it is the rank and file, impatient and feeling itself unfairly treated, that will make it hard for the leaders to temporize.

Will the Republicans Save the League?

THE immensely confused conflict which rages about the peace treaty has now been reduced to concrete form by the reports of the Senate Committee. It is perhaps for the purpose of attempting an examination of the choices which are presented for debate on the floor of the Senate.

The reservations touching domestic affairs and the Monroe Doctrine may be put aside for the moment as raising no real issue between Mr. Wilson and the Senators who oppose him. All appear to be agreed that questions touching the Americas are excluded from jurisdiction. Mr. Wilson himself has said that he did not wish to define the Monroe Doctrine because the United States might wish to extend it and that he did not wish to enumerate domestic questions because the list might not be inclusive enough. The problems of the western hemisphere are thus by agreement on both sides excluded. So, too, by tacit consent are all problems affecting the high seas. The action of the League is confined to the great land mass of Europe, Asia, and Africa, and the issue to be settled in the Senate is the relation of the United States to that territory and to the people living on it.

The present treaty attempts to define that relationship. Not only does it provide for American membership in the League, but it does two other things of great importance. It engages the United States in a general guaranty, and it involves participation in the commissions set up to administer the settlement with Germany. What Mr. Lodge's report proposes to do is to create a League, but to cut out both the general guaranties and the particular duty of administering the Treaty with Germany. In a very exact sense the amendments and reservations dissociate the League of Nations from the treaty with Germany. They will also dissociate the League from the other treaties now being framed at Paris.

The partisans of Mr. Wilson will, of course, claim that this drastic separation of the League and the treaties is a destruction of the League. The truth is, in our opinion, more likely to be the exact contrary. The action may prove to be the salvation of the League. The thing which emerged from Paris under the fine name of a League of Nations was the original idea prostituted to the enforcement of an impossible and disorderly settlement. Some there were who hoped that the League might correct the settlement, but those who looked more closely at the matter soon realized that this was improbable. To make the League an agency

Copyright of New Republic is the property of New Republic and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.